727 included the creation of a Duchy of Courland and a Duchy of Estonia
648 and Livonia in personal union with the Crown of Prussia, and the organization of extensive German colonization in those Provinces. To this end, in each Province the old *Landtag* and *Landesrat*, consisting of representatives of the Baltic Barons, were hastily revived. On March 8, 1918, the *Landesrat* of Courland invited the Kaiser to accept the Grand-ducal crown of Courland; the invitation was graciously accepted. An unsuccessful attempt was made to persuade the district Elders of Estonia and Livonia, summoned to a conference at Riga on April 10 for the purpose, to consent to union with the Prussian Crown; the fear of German colonization was too strong. M. Konstantin Paets, the chief organizer of resistance to such a scheme, was imprisoned in a Polish concentration camp. In default of popular consent, Baron Dellingshausen, the leader of the Baltic Barons in Estonia, sent a request for union to the Kaiser, who conveyed his 'consent' to it on April 21. In July 1918 agrarian regulations were issued providing for a Colonization Union in Courland, at whose disposal the Baltic Barons placed a third of their landed property for the purpose of fresh German colonization: all private land agreements for the last thirty years were to be annulled, without any provision being made for expropriated peasants.

● [423]

728 *Lithuania.* In Lithuania, hoping to make capital out of the Russian
649 Provisional Government's unsympathetic attitude towards the
186 Lithuanian nationalists, and with a view to creating a body which
[668] would lend itself to the furtherance of annexation schemes, the German authorities rashly permitted a nationalist movement to take shape in the autumn of 1917. Immediately after the Russian evacuation of Vilna, a conference of over 200 leaders, selected by an organizing committee, met there and passed a resolution that Lithuania should become an independent democratic State within her ethnographic frontiers, and that a Constituent Assembly should be convened. The conference appointed. for the conduct of affairs in the interim period, a National Council or *Taryba*, consisting of twenty-six members, including six representatives of minorities, with M. Antanas Smetona as its president. Under German pressure, the *Taryba* adopted further resolutions on December 11, which, while claiming the reconstitution of an independent State with Vilna as its capital, omitted all mention of a Constituent Assembly, and even asked for German aid during the period of reconstruction in the form of a 'perpetual and solid alliance' with the German Empire. In a rescript of March 23, 1918, the Kaiser granted *de jure* recognition of Lithuanian independence on the basis of the December resolutions; but by this time the *Taryba*, realizing the character of the peace negotiations with Russia at Brest-Litovsk, to which they had been refused per-

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date) 1938 RB1 Baltic States RB1

000 virtual disappearance of the former Russian and German official classes.

178 554 565 Moreover, the social structure of the former Russian provinces had crumbled, and the Baltic peoples, who had hitherto been the least considered members of society, were now masters in their own house, chaotic though that house might be. This shift in the balance of power gave rise to a whole series of special problems concerned with the regulation of the relations between the various sections of the community, ranging from the redistribution among the peasants of land which had formerly belonged to the large estate owners, to the definition and stabilization of the position of the national minorities, and the adjustment of the relations between the States and the various religious denominations. It is proposed to reserve discussion of the constitutional and political history of the new States till a later chapter, and to summarize here the ways in which they handled some of the other problems with which they were confronted.

1. Agrarian Reform

●423 471 The first concern of the Baltic Governments was the expropriation of the great landed estates and their redistribution among the peasants. Even before the new Constitutions had been drafted, agrarian laws were passed in Estonia in October 1919, and in Latvia in September 1920, while in Lithuania there was a whole series of decrees starting in December 1918, and culminating in the Agrarian Law proper in April 1922.

In Estonia, the reforms were effected almost entirely at the expense of the Baltic Barons;[1] in Latvia, the burden was borne largely by the German Balts, the Poles, and Russians, and some fifty Latvian landowners; while in Lithuania the chief sufferers were the Poles and Russians, especially those who had obtained land on privileged terms from the Russian Government and such institutions as the Nobles' Bank, the Peasants' Land Bank, and the Orthodox Church, the German-Balt element here being negligible.

The treatment meted out to the dispossessed landlords was far more severe in Estonia than in the other two countries, for here they were deprived even of a minimum amount of land for their own use, whereas in Latvia and Lithuania they were at least allowed to retain small residual estates ranging in size from 50 to 100 hectares. In the matter of compensation the Latvian régime was the most severe, for, although the Constituent Assembly had recognized its desirability in principle, a law was passed in April 1924 providing that there should be no indemnity. The limited amount of compensation

[1] About 86·5 per cent. of the expropriated land belonged to the Baltic Barons, 2·8 to Russians, 6·4 to foreigners, and 4·3 to Estonians.

423 provided in Lithuania by the law of 1922, and in Estonia by a law
471 of March 5, 1926, proved in practice to be negligible, owing to the currencies in which it was expressed.[1] Petitions on the subject of compensation presented to the League of Nations by the German Balts of Estonia (1926) and Latvia (1925), and by Polish landowners in Lithuania (1925), were all rejected on the ground that agrarian reform constituted a social, and not a minority, question.

The ways in which the lands thus nationalized by the agrarian laws were distributed, and the effects of the redistribution on the economic life of the three countries, are described elsewhere.[2] It is enough here to stress the fact that the chief beneficiaries were the landless agri-
423 cultural labourers, the small-holders, and the tenant farmers. The
178 abolition of the semi-feudal society which had survived up to the World War, and the creation of a large class of peasant proprietors, were factors which very largely determined the lines on which the political life of the new Republics would develop. They explain, in part, not only the failure of Communism to take root in these countries in spite of the proximity to Soviet Russia of two, at least, of them, but also the gradually declining influence of the Socialist and other Left parties in the years immediately following the setting up of the Republics, and the eventual establishment of agrarian dictatorships in Estonia and Latvia in 1934.

2. National Minorities[3]

563 *Lithuania.* At the last census, taken in 1923, the national minor-
162 ities in Lithuania together formed 16·12 per cent. of her total population, which then numbered 2,028,971.[4] The Jews, the largest group,[5] were chiefly to be found in the towns, and played an important part in the business life of the country, whereas the Russian minority consisted chiefly of peasants who settled in certain parts of the country more or less *en masse*, under the Tsarist régime, together with some 4,000 White Russian peasant colonists. The Germans,

[1] In Estonia compensation was based on the pre-War value of the rouble; for the Lithuanian arrangements, see below, p. 107.

[2] See below, pp. 105–9.

[3] Much of the material for this section was obtained from C. A. Macartney, *National States and National Minorities*, Oxford University Press, 1934.

[4] Table 1. *Population of Lithuania (excluding Memel) According to Race (1923 census).*

	Lithuanians	*Jews*	*Russians*	*Germans*	*Poles*	*Letts*	*Others*
Number . . .	1,701,863	153,743	54,881	29,231	65,599	14,883	8,771
Percentage of total population . .	83·88	7·58	2·70	1·44	3·23	0·73	0·44

[5] The density of the Jewish population in Lithuania, which resembles that of Poland and Eastern Rumania, is due to the fact that Lithuania, before 1918, formed part of the Russian 'Pale', within which alone the Jews were allowed to settle without special permission. Thus the Jewish problem in Lithuania differs radically from that in the other Baltic countries.

by the Socialist Opposition through the German minority's eleventh-hour renunciation of the subsidy. In the following November a Bill tabled by Socialist initiative was passed, depriving members of the national minorities of the right to benefit from the distribution of confiscated lands to ex-servicemen, on the ground that they had not shared in the struggle for Latvian independence. These moves, which were primarily designed to overthrow the Government by creating a strong nationalist feeling, were regarded by the German minority as an insult aimed directly at themselves, and they proceeded to withdraw their representative, Herr Berent, from the Cabinet as a protest.

In 1931, under the bourgeois-conservative Ulmanis Government formed in May, and later under the nationalist-bourgeois Skujenieks Ministry of November, there were further attacks on the privileges of the minorities. A new law prescribing the exclusive use of Lettish in the *Saeima*[1] was rejected in December of that year, but an emergency decree issued in October deprived the Germans of all rights over Riga Cathedral, its museum, and its vicarages, which had been in their hands for over 700 years, a measure which aroused the more resentment since a proposal to this effect had already been rejected by the *Saeima* in the previous May and by a plebiscite held in the summer.

The Polish minority, too, came in for its share of attention in the autumn of 1931; the closing of six elementary Polish schools, the suppression of a Polish newspaper, the suspension of the Polish League of Catholic Youth and the Association of Latgalian Poles, and the latter's final dissolution, led to the resignation of one of the Polish deputies in the *Saeima*. But, when the wave of strong nationalist feeling due to the elections had subsided, conditions improved somewhat, and in March 1932 the Poles were allowed full cultural autonomy again.

Under the dictatorship established in May 1934 the privileges of the minorities sustained a fresh series of assaults. Two decrees were issued in June; the first providing that, in families where either of the parents was of Lettish nationality, the children must attend Lettish schools, and that, where the father and mother belonged to different national minorities, the father's nationality, rather than the language spoken in the household, was to be the decisive factor; the second prescribing Lettish as the sole written or spoken language in all State and communal services, except in districts at least half of whose inhabitants were registered at the last census as speaking a language other than Lettish. In July the German Autonomous

[1] Hitherto, both Russian and German had customarily been spoken in the *Saeima*, in addition to Lettish, though there was no law specifically permitting their use.

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date) 1938 RB1 Baltic States RB1
Lithuania

648 ship, and to disenfranchise a large number of voters. Influenced,
361 however, by Herr Hitler's bitter denunciations in the Reichstag on
666 September 15, and by a further *démarche* of the three Powers on the 12th, the Lithuanian Government at last agreed to make certain concessions with regard to the German parties and to the conduct of the elections, which were watched by the British *Chargé d'affaires* at Kaunas, and were on the whole fairly conducted. The net result of all these efforts was the election of twenty-four candidates of the *Einheitsliste* and five Lithuanians; thus the latter failed to gain a single seat.

642 The usual post-election period of appeasement ensued; for—after
361 the failure of two attempts to form a Directorate under a Lithuanian
648 President—M. Baldžius, a Lithuanian Memellander and a member of the *Einheitsliste*, was appointed President.[1] The new Directorate, which received a vote of confidence from the Diet in December, repealed a number of anti-Nazi measures and began the reinstatement of officials who had been dismissed on political grounds. During 1936, moreover, there was a marked improvement in German-Lithuanian relations, beginning with a Lithuanian request for British mediation at the end of 1935, and continuing with a *rapprochement* initiated by Germany with startling suddenness in the spring of 1936;[2] and economic conditions in Memel were considerably benefited by a frontier traffic agreement concluded between the two countries in the following August. In October M. Kurkauskas resigned and was replaced by M. Kubilius, a Lithuanian lawyer who had hitherto
[666] played little part in political life. Although there were fresh arrests and trials of Nazis during 1936–7, on the other hand a large number of amnesties were granted,[3] and in February 1937 the British Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs was able to inform the House of Commons that 'the political position in the Memel territory is now generally satisfactory'.[4]

Note on the Economic Position of Memel

361 The economic prosperity of the Memel Territory is now entirely
433 dependent upon that of Lithuania. This is primarily due to the fact

[1] In January 1936 M. Baldžius was replaced by M. Diomons, also a member of the *Einheitsliste*.

[2] See above, p. 88.

[3] Most of the National-Socialists imprisoned have now been released, including Pastor von Sass (in 1937) and Dr. Neumann (in 1938).

● 423 [4] Unfortunately, however, a fresh occasion for agitation was provided by the Kaunas Government's law of September 6, 1937, expropriating, against compensation, some 440 hectares of territory belonging to 24 German landowners, for military purposes and harbour development. A violent campaign ensued in the German press; and on September 25 M. Baldžius informed the Memel Diet that the Directorate had protested to the Governor against the law on the ground that the expropriation of property was exclusively the concern of the Memel authorities, and had declined to co-operate in its execution. The German Government themselves (although, not being signatories of the Convention, they had no

that Memel is at present Lithuania's only practicable access to the sea. Moreover, since 1923 a large number of important industries have been established in and near the town with the object of supplying the Lithuanian hinterland; and thus a large proportion of Lithuania's industries are located in Memel. While these two circumstances have undoubtedly led to a noteworthy increase in the economic importance of Memel since the War, Memel has suffered much, on the other hand, through the closing of the Polish-Lithuanian frontier since 1920; for, as the result, what was formerly her chief source of income, namely the handling of timber floated down the Niemen from Poland, has ceased to exist.

At present over three-quarters of Lithuania's exports by value, and over two-thirds of her imports, are effected by sea through the port of Memel. In addition, goods are imported through Memel in transit for Russia and sometimes Latvia, and the same is true of exports. Traffic through Memel (in net registered tons) is now more than three-quarters that of Tallinn. During the last few years the practice of importing or exporting through the Latvian port of Liepāja has somewhat decreased in favour of Memel.

To this the completion in 1932 of the Siaulisi–Telsiai–Kretinga railway has greatly contributed, since previously railway communication between Central Lithuania and Memel involved a long detour, either to the south, almost as far as Tilsit, or to the north through Latvian territory; and Liepāja was thus nearer to Kaunas than was Memel. The result of this increase can be seen from the following table:

TABLE 12. *Imports, Exports, and Shipping through Memel, 1932–7*

	Exports from Memel by sea (mill. lits)	*Percentage of total Lithuanian exports*	*Imports into Memel by sea (mill. lits)*	*Percentage of total Lithuanian imports*	*Shipping entered through Memel ('000 net registered tons)*
1932	123·6	65·4	78·3	46·9	519·7
1933	106·6	66·6	79·0	55·6	600·7
1934	97·3	66·1	83·9	60·5	622·6
1935	115·2	77·6	80·0	62·2	691·3
1936	149·4	78·4	106·2	68·0	788·5
1937	157·0	75·3	145·0	66·0	844·7

Out of the 844,700 net registered tons of shipping entering Memel during 1937, 294,400 tons were German, 150,000 Swedish, and 145,800

locus standi) protested at Kaunas, but were told that the law was valid under the Statute and could not be altered, although guarantees could be given that it would not be used for other than its ostensible purpose.

727 other forms of production. Before the War Latvia, and to a smaller
234 extent Estonia also, had supplied St. Petersburg with butter and
433 other dairy produce. This trade, too, was lost after the Revolution,
[439] but the fact that it existed independently of foreign supplies suggested that dairy farming might be expanded so as to assume some of the importance formerly held in their economic systems by manufacturing industry. In this the development of the co-operative principle was of great assistance, and, during the period which ended in 1931, the two countries were able to make both ends meet by exploiting their forests and developing foreign markets for their butter and bacon, while their industries were still able to supply some of their own requirements of manufactured goods. Lithuania, though lacking manufacturing industries such as those possessed by the other two countries, followed a similar policy, and her success in finding foreign markets for her agricultural produce was the more remarkable in that the commercial organization of the country immediately after the War could not be compared with that of Estonia and Latvia. To sum up, then, the period 1918–31 described in the following section was one of reconstruction and of fundamental adjustment to the new conditions both inside and outside the Baltic. On the whole this process was highly successful, and it was no fault of the Baltic States that the conditions changed with the crisis of 1929–32.

Note: Except where otherwise stated, figures given in the tables are taken from the various statistical works published by the League of Nations, such as the Statistical Annuals, the annual memoranda on Foreign Trade and Balances of Payments, and the memoranda on Public Finance. Figures have occasionally been given in Swiss francs for comparative purposes. This is the old Swiss franc, the parity of which was 25·2215 to the £ gold, not the Swiss franc current since the devaluation of September 1936.

PART I: GENERAL FEATURES OF THE POST-WAR ECONOMY OF THE BALTIC STATES, 1919–30

I. THE PRODUCTIVE SYSTEM, 1919–30

BEFORE the growth of the productive system in this period is described, reference must be made to two developments: agrarian reform and the expansion of the co-operative system.

1. SPECIAL FEATURES

471 (i) *Agrarian Reform.*[1]

● 423 Although the growth of peasant ownership had proceeded rather more quickly in the Baltic Provinces than in the rest of Russia, a very large proportion of the land was still owned by a few large

[1] For the political effects of this see above, pp. 29–30.

holders immediately before the War. The large holders in Estonia and Latvia were chiefly the so-called Baltic Barons, the German landowning aristocracy, although in all these countries Russian landlords (usually absentee), and the Church, owned a considerable area. During the first few years after the War the large estates were nearly all split up into small-holdings, and the typical Baltic peasant is now the small-holder who works his own land.

Estonia. Of the total area in 1918 in Estonia 58 per cent. belonged to no more than 1,149 estates of an average size of 2,113 ha., rather more than half of which were leased to small-holders. This land was expropriated during the years 1919–26 and leased or granted to small-holders by the State, which, however, retained in its own possession that part of the land which consisted of forests. The result of these and other reforms was that, according to the agricultural census of 1929, the land was owned, or leased by the State, as follows:[1]

TABLE 13. *Number and Size of Holdings in Estonia*

Number of holdings	*Size of holding*
24,000	under 5 ha.
22,000	from 5–10 „
35,000	„ 10–20 „
24,000	„ 20–30 „
22,000	„ 30–50 „
6,000	„ 50–100 „
500	over 100 „

Latvia. Similarly in Latvia only 39 per cent. of the cultivated land was owned by small-holders in 1900, and even after the Lettish revolution of 1905[2] in Courland nine noble families owned one-fifth of the land in 1914.[3] The reform was effected in 1920. About five-sixths of the forests were declared State property. Of the remainder all the land except that belonging since 1915 to Latvian subjects, if in holdings of not more than 100 ha., was placed at the disposal of the State, though further exceptions were made of land belonging to charitable or scientific institutions, and the communes. The land thus appropriated by the State was then redistributed in lots of not more than 27 ha. each. In 1924 the Latvian Parliament decided not to grant compensation to the former landlords except in respect of certain debts arising out of mortgages. An appeal by the landowners to the League of Nations in 1925 was not considered, on the ground that the reform was of a social nature and did not affect the question

[1] *Estonia: Population, Cultural and Economic Life*, edited by A. Pullerits, Tallinn, 1935, pp. 69–70; and Henri de Montfort, *Les Nouveaux États de la Baltique*, Paris, 1933, p. 125.
[2] De Montfort, op. cit., p. 118; and *Foreign Office Peace Handbook*, No. 50.
[3] *Foreign Office Peace Handbook*, No. 50, p. 56; and Alfreds Bilmanis, *Latvia in the Making, 1918–28*, Riga, 1928.

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date)1938 RB1 Baltic States 181
Latvia
Lithuania

of minorities. The result of these reforms is that the land is distributed somewhat as follows:[1] 471 423

TABLE 14. *Number and Size of Holdings in Latvia*

Number of holdings	*Size of holding*
109,000	under 10 ha.
51,000	from 10–20 „
24,000	„ 20–30 „
21,000	„ 30–50 „
18,000	„ 50–100 „
2,000	over 100 „

Lithuania. Land reform in Lithuania had been an issue as far back as 1905, for the large owners were chiefly absentee Russians and there were few of the 'improving' Baltic Barons. The question was thus more acute than in the other Provinces. Some progress was made before the War, however, and it is calculated[2] that in 1914 about 50 per cent. of the total cultivated area was in the hands of small-holders, but chiefly in plots which were uneconomically small. The most important legislation was enacted between 1919 and 1922. Forest land, if in plots of more than 25 ha., was declared State property. Other land formerly belonging to the Russian State, the nobility, the Church, and other estates of more than 80 ha. were also declared State property and allotted in small portions to the landless, who paid a nominal price in kind or money. Compensation to the former owners was allowed in most cases, but the currency in which the payments were expressed, viz. the Ostmark, depreciated so soon and so rapidly that the real value received was usually negligible. Some of the Polish landowners who had been dispossessed appealed to the League of Nations in 1925, but only to obtain a ruling similar to that given in the case of Latvia. The consequence of the redistribution—which is still to some extent in progress—can be seen from the figures of the census of 1931:[3]

TABLE 15. *Number and Size of Holdings in Lithuania*

Number of holdings	*Size of holding*
132,000	under 10 ha.
93,000	from 10–20 „
34,000	„ 20–30 „
21,000	„ 30–50 „
6,000	„ 50–100 „
1,000	over 100 „

(ii) *The Co-operative System.*

The result of these reforms was at first a considerable dislocation of the productive system and a decrease of efficiency. This was 423 433

[1] De Montfort, op. cit., pp. 113–14.
[2] Ibid., p. 114.
[3] Department of Overseas Trade: *Economic Conditions in Lithuania during 1931*, publ. 1932, p. 13.

●423 433 particularly noticeable where the larger estates of the Baltic Barons had been split up—chiefly in Estonia and Latvia. Here, for example, farm buildings were often separated by the redistribution from the land which they had formerly served. Moreover, an entirely new class of landowners was called into being. These new small-holders were often ignorant of scientific agricultural methods, and were nearly always without means. It can therefore be seen that a whole series of problems was created by the reforms, which, throughout the period, it was the chief objective of agricultural policy to solve. The solution was found largely in the extension of the co-operative system.

474 Before the War there were numerous agricultural societies in existence in Estonia, Courland, and Livonia, and to a smaller extent in Lithuania. The idea, therefore, was not new. What was new was the notion that the pre-War agricultural associations could be developed to the point where they became the central pivot of the [234] entire agricultural organization. The pre-War functions of these societies had been to organize savings banks, to purchase machinery for the use of members, to promote the use of artificial fertilizers, to pay for instructors, and not least to deal on the co-operative system in dairy produce. The last-named activity was, of course, essentially suited to the new conditions after the War, which had created a large number of small-holders, and it is in this direction that the development of the co-operative system was most remarkable.

474 234 439 *Estonia.* Co-operation developed in Estonia less during this period, perhaps, than in the other two countries, except as regards dairy farming. However, co-operative dairies increased from 60 in 1918 to 331 in 1929, and the two co-operative marketing associations soon succeeded in obtaining a market for Estonian butter abroad. Much encouragement was given by the Government, particularly as regards grading; and, by the end of the period, between 60 and 70 per cent. of Estonia's exports of butter was in the hands of these two societies. There was also a considerable extension of co-operative buying abroad,[1] mainly of agricultural machinery resold by the retail societies, while the number of societies which were formed to enable members to obtain the use of agricultural machinery increased from 28 in 1914 to about 800 in 1929. In addition, the co-operative system greatly aided the production and export of bacon, eggs, and potatoes. On the whole, however, Estonia left development rather more to the State and to individual enterprise than did Latvia or Lithuania.

ooo *Latvia.* As in Estonia, the co-operative system of Latvia had been

[1] Through the Estonian Co-operative Wholesale Society, known as the E.T.K.

2: Milosz S-5 (no date)1953 El Europe
Baltic Countries

foreigners (changing their names, if necessary) vote, represent, and rule.

Thus the inhabitants of the Baltic states became Soviet citizens. In the eyes of the new authorities this mass of people, who were so well off that they put the rest of the Union to shame, represented a scandalous relic of the past. They had to be educated. Prisons filled and, shortly, certain categories of citizens began to be deported to work camps, mines, and collective farms at the other end of Russia, chiefly in the polar regions. In 1941 the entire area was invaded by the German army. The Nazis, in turn, started to kill off that category of the population which their ideology classified as undesirable, namely the Jews, irrespective of age, sex, or class. To that task they applied their usual precision. At the same time they exported to the Reich a large number of forcibly enlisted workers.

In 1944 the Baltic states were recaptured by the Red Army and the Center set out to assimilate this area into the Union. The most urgent task was the destruction of the existing and wealthy farming economy. Collectivization met with considerable obstacles, however. The usual method, that of "intensifying the class struggle in the village," which speculates upon the antagonism between rich and poor farmers, had feeble results. Training in partisan units, together with the large number of arms left from war-time operations, encouraged opposition. Peasants fled to the woods and formed bands. In reprisal, disciplinary expeditions surrounded villages and killed those who had remained at home. This merely increased the opposition; for whole villages, including women and children, often preferred to join the partisans rather than expose themselves to the danger of being taken hostage.

The hostile attitude of these people forced those in power to resort to radical measures. Big man-hunts were

[Moscow -- Analyst]

6: Shuster S-4 (no date) 1954 El Europe
Baltic Countries RBI

Even Nazism was by comparison liberal. Officials assigned the task, direct the government, the press, and education. The Russian language is of course taught in the schools. A relatively recent report from Estonia reads:

> Teachers of the Russian language must explain to their pupils the universal importance of this great tongue. It is the language used by Lenin, the greatest genius of the human race. It is the tongue in which Stalin addresses the toiling masses of the world. The Russian language will enable the student to understand Russian culture . . . and to acquire a knowledge of the world's most notable scientific achievements.

Training in the Russian language is accompanied by the dissemination of Communist classics, notably the works of Lenin, made available in cheap editions and foisted off on workers regardless of their wishes. Young people in particular are targets for Communist indoctrination, and nowhere have they been bombarded with greater vigor than in the Baltic area. There can be little doubt that in twenty years virtually all awareness of Christian thought and feeling will have disappeared, save among the rare survivors of an older generation.

All the usual devices—nationalization of Church property, suppression of religious education—have of course been resorted to here. The kolkhoz system has been widely introduced into Lithuania, largely in order to restore the efficiency of an agricultural system depleted of usable labor by the deportations. Although nearly all of these are reported to be under direct Russian control, the results appear to have been disappointing. A report assumed to be reliable has this to say:

> The names of Estonian kolkhozes provide a most interesting commentary on Communist propaganda and on the strict hierarchical sys-

6: Shuster S-4 (no date) 1954 El Europe
Baltic Countries RBI

423 tem which prevails in the Soviet Union. Stalin has 26 or 27 kolkhozes dedicated to him; Lenin has 25; Marx, 6; and Engels, only 2. The kolkhozes named after Stalin are larger than the others and are situated in the most fertile regions. Whereas ordinary kolkhozes have some 120 cows, Stalin's have from 450 to 700. Workers on Stalin kolkhozes receive higher wages than are paid on others. Stalin kolkhozes are never criticized in the press and are invariably run by well known, active Communists. Other living Soviet leaders also have kolkhozes dedicated to them: Molotov has 9 named after him; Voroshilov, 7. Zhandov, who in 1940 accomplished the Sovietization of Estonia, has 6. Other kolkhozes with Russian names are Stalingrad, Volga, Ukraine, Gorki, Pushkin, and Lysenko. Not a single one, however, has been named for a living Estonian except that adorned with the cognomen of the Soviet Union's wrestling champion, Johannes Kotkas.

793 About the only notable action against a prelate of standing
687 which has been adequately reported is the trial of the Bishop of Danzig, Carl Maria Splett, who was brought to the dock for assisting the Nazi oppressors. The Bishop, a stanch and zealous man, protested his innocence; and there was no evidence whatsoever that he had in any way aided the infamous cause of the Nazis. He had, indeed, contended bravely against the depredations of Hitler's minions on the freedom and mission of the Church. Nevertheless *Osservatore Romano* reported, on February 3, 1946, that he had been sentenced to prison for eight years because he had "assisted the German occupants to the detriment of the Polish people." Bishop Splett is still in duress.

725 What we do know about the fate of these people rests upon an infinitely painstaking, imaginative piecing together of very small bits of information. Thus it is possible to say that there was considerable guerrilla resistance, particularly by peasants; that the armed bands were surrounded in the forest and mowed down; that villages were thereupon razed, as Lidice